IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA ELKINS

ISRAEL REYES,

Petitioner,

٧.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:11-CV-86 (BAILEY)

KUMA DEBOO.

Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On this day, the above-styled matter came before the Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge David J. Joel. By Local Rule, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Joel for submission of a proposed report and a recommendation ("R&R"). Magistrate Judge Joel filed his R&R on November 28, 2011 [Doc. 29]. In that filing, the magistrate judge recommended that this Court deny the petitioner's Motion for Permission to Leave to Amend [Doc. 20], deny the petitioner's Motion for Extension of Time to File Documents [Doc. 28], and dismiss the matter without prejudice for the failure to exhaust administrative remedies [Doc. 29 at 4].

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140,

150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo

review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Snyder v.

Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91,

94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Joel's R&R were due within

fourteen (14) days of receipt, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b).

The docket reflects that service was accepted on November 29, 2011 [Doc. 30]. To date,

no objections have been filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the report and

recommendation for clear error.

Upon careful review of the report and recommendation, it is the opinion of this Court

that the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation [Doc. 29] should be, and is,

hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's

report. As such, this Court hereby **DENIES** the petitioner's Motion for Permission to Leave

to Amend [Doc. 20], DENIES the petitioner's Motion for Extension of Time to File

Documents [Doc. 28], and DISMISSES this matter without prejudice. Therefore, this

matter is hereby **ORDERED STRICKEN** from the active docket of this Court. The Clerk

is directed to enter a separate judgment in favor of the respondent.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record and

to mail a copy to the pro se petitioner.

DATED: December 21, 2011.

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE